Remarks

too

Apologies are tendered for the all to human mistakes corrected in or by the changes in the claims indicated in the preceding. To remedy these mistakes a copy of the claims as presented in the 23 April 2007 document has been obtained from a word processor and obvious changes have been made to correct the items mentioned in the preceding. At the same time a minor spelling error has been corrected in claim 7 and an obvious typographical error has been corrected in claim 12.

The changes made have not been set off in any special manner since they are so minor in character. The corrections in claim 7 and 12 correspond to those previously made in writing and were initialed and dated by me in the prior document. Thus these changes are not really "new" but are presented in a slightly different typed form in the claims as now submitted. Other not previously recognized spelling errors have been similarly corrected

If the Examiner is of the opinion that any other minor "technical" problems or complications remain in connection with this case he is requested to call the undersign so that they can be resolved. The substantive issues with respect to this applicant ion need not be overshadowed by essentially minor details.

The Examiner may wish to note the favorable reception that the subject matter of this application received at the recent cold fusion conference in Russia. It is assumed that he keeps up to date on matters such as this in the in the continuous "stream" of technical literature. It is believed that the prior refusals of the claims should be abandoned because at this time opinions in the precise field of the

gh) 5-01

claimed subject matter are increasingly changed so as to be increasingly favorable to the patentability of the subject matter claimed, which can be construed as favorable to an applicant. Throughout history new developments have often been rejected by many established "experts" even when these same developments are accepted by others. Thus it is understood that some "learned" individuals continued to write that flight was impossible for up to about 2 years after the Wright brothers had achieved and demonstrated to others the operative character of their invention. It is considered that a similar situation has and is occurring in connection with the subject matter claimed. That the concepts of what has been claimed are now sufficiently accepted so that there is no legitimate question about the operative character of the subject matter claimed.

Respectfully submitted -

August 15, 2007

John Dash, Applicant, on behalf of himself and

the Assignee of the noted Application